

Ahadeeth on Virtues of 15th Sha'baan and
Shaikh Albaani

Bismillah ir-Rehmaan ir-Raheem

Written by: Shaikh Khabeeb Ahmed Athari
(hafidhahullah)

Translator: Raza Hassan



Some innovators on the night of 15 Sha'baan, not only kindle lights in their Mosques but they also arrange congregational Salaat ut-Tasbeeh etc, and they also innovate many other innovations in the name of religion and consider these so called Ibaadaat to be extremely virtuous. And in order to strengthen their innovated views, they are often seen taking the help of some useless & baseless proofs. Therefore if for this very sake, they had to bring a proof from another planet, they would not wait for a second to do that. In fact, even if they find a proof that somewhat supports their Madhab, they would open their arms for it very happily and run towards the Crowds (to proclaim it to them).

Only recently in the roads and streets of the streets, a bunch of banners etc were seen for the advertisement of Salaat ut-Tasbeeh on the 15th night of Sha'baan and many posters were also distributed on this occasion, and to support this innovated actions of theirs, they presented the opinion of Shaikh Albaani (rahimahullah). Therefore, it has been written that:

يطلع الله تبارك وتعالى إلى خلقه ليلة النصف من شعبان، فيغفر لجميع خلقه إلا
"لمشرك أو مشاحن"

"Allaah tabaarak wa ta'ala descends towards his creation on the night of 15th of Sha'baan, and forgives all his creation except a Polytheist or one who harbors hatred against the Muslims"

[Ibn Maajah: 1390]

Allaamah Albaani said:

"The summary is that verily this hadeeth is authentic due to these Shawaahid. And the authenticity of a hadeeth can also be proven from the Shawaahid less in number than this, as long as it does not have severe weakness, as is the case with this hadeeth---- and those who

declared it Da'eef have hurried in this matter and they did not fulfill the right of tahqeeq"

[al-Silsilah as-Saheehah: 3/135-137-139]

To strengthen their innovation, Ahl ul-Bid'ah took the support of this saying of Imaam al-Albaani (rahimahullah) and took his authentication for this hadeeth as a shield to say that a huge Imaam of the world has strengthened their action. Therefore, all our actions on this night hold the acceptance of Allaah. Inna Lillaahi wa Inna Ilaihi Raaji'oon!

There is no doubt on the fact that Imaam al-Albaani (rahimahullah) is a huge Scholar and a Muhaddith. The existence of such people on earth is really a blessing of Allaah, and such people are hardly born after centuries. The line that Imaam Albaani drew between Saheeh and Da'eef and cleared the milk out of water, is really a big gift for the Ummah and a vicious poison for the people of Bid'ah, and they completely fulfill the demand of the ayah: ["That He might cause the truth to triumph and bring falsehood to nothing"](#) [Anfaal: 8].

Despite this eminence, some people of knowledge have pointed out some mistakes of this Imaam, and he even has recanted from many of his opinions after the truth was revealed to him and also advised his students to correct those mistakes. In fact, his students have written a complete book on his withdrawals which is published and available everywhere.

Among these mistakes, one of the mistakes also includes the authenticity of the ahadeeth on the virtues of 15 Sha'baan. The basic reason for this mistake is that Imaam Albaani took the baseless hadeeth of Mu'aadh (radiallah anhu) as a base, and presented seven shawaahid of this hadeeth, which we will discuss on its time.

May Allaah reward Imaam Albaani for his services and make his works the cause of the increase in his reward. Ameen.

It is an undeniable fact that the authentication of later Scholars for a hadeeth cannot at all benefit, if the classic (Mutaqaddimeen) Scholars – the experts in this field declared it to be baseless, Mudtarib, Da’eef, and the mistake of its narrators. This is not the place for its details. For those who are interested should see: Assas Naqad ul-Hadeeth bayna Aimmah al-Naqad wa Aimmah Asr al-Hadeeth by Shaikh Shareef Haatim bin Aarif al-Awfi (P. 341-412) from the book “Ada’atu Bahthiyyah fi Uloom us-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah”.

Now let’s observe the proofs of Shaikh Albaani:

حدثنا هشام بن خالد حدثنا أبو خليل عتبة بن حماد عن الأوزاعي وابن ثوبان عن أبيه
عن مكحول عن مالك بن يخامر عن معاذ عنه مرفوعاً: يطلع الله تبارك وتعالى إلى خلقه
ليلة النصف من شعبان، فيغفر لجميع خلقه إلا لمشرك أو مشاحن

Hishaam bin Khaalid narrated to us, Abu Khulayd Utbah bin Hamaad narrated to us from al-Awzaa’ee and Ibn Thawbaan from his Father from Makhool from Maalik bin Yukhaamir from Muaa’dh, who narrated from the Prophet (peace be upon him) that: “Allaah tabaarak wa ta’ala descends towards his creation on the night of 15th of Sha’baan, and forgives all his creation except a Polytheist or one who harbors hatred against the Muslims”

[as-Sunnah by Ibn Abi Aasim: 512; Silsilah as-Saheehah: 3/135]

Besides Ibn Hibbaan, many others have also narrated it. Imaam Dhahabi said: “Makhool did not meet Maalik bin Yukhaamir, if this weakness is not there than its chain is Hasan and all its narrators are Thiqah.”

Haafidh Haythami said: “Imaam Tabaraani has narrated it in Al-Mu’jam al-Kabeer and al-Mu’jam al-Awsat and all its narrators are Thiqah”

[Silsilah as-Saheehah: 1/135 H. 1144]

This narration is narrated in, al-Mu'jam al-Kabeer (20/108-109), al-Mu'jam al-Awsat (7/397), Musnad ash-Shaamain (1/128-129, 4/360), Saheeh Ibn Hibbaan (7/370), Mawaarid uz-Zamaan by Haythami (1980), Hilyat ul-Awliya by Ibn Abi Dunya (5/191), Shu'b al-Emaan (3/382), Fadhaail al-Awqaat by Bayhaqi (22) and others.

Though the only barrier in the authentication of this hadeeth according to Imaam Al-Albaani is that Makhool did not meet his teacher Maalik bin Yukhaamir, and he even narrated the saying of Imaam Dhahabi in its affirmation; whereas, this hadeeth, leave aside Saheeh, is not even Da'eef, rather baseless and unproven.

Normally, the narration of a thiqah narrator is declared Saheeh and the narration of a Sudooq narrator is declared Hasan, but most of the time Scholars do not bother to look into the hidden defects present in a hadeeth, or they do not consider it important to go into such details. Whereas, these defects sometimes, affect the hadeeth in such a way that they become baseless, and such are the ahadeeth which the experts of this field remember with the words like: Baatil, Mawdoo, Munkar, Da'eef Jiddan, or Basless etc, even though the narrators of those ahadeeth are not of the level that their ahadeeth should be criticized with that severe words. That is why the reason for this severe criticism is to describe the doubt and mistake of Thiqah narrators in the chain or text of a hadeeth.

When it gets proven that so-and-so hadeeth is the cause of the mistake/doubt of a narrator then it cannot be accepted both through Aql or Naql, because the chain or matan of the hadeeth exists in the mind and intellect of a Thiqah, Sudooq or Da'eef narrator, it does not exist in reality, and such a narration cannot be presented as a proof. In fact, it cannot also be taken to strengthen another narration.

The same condition is found in the strongest and basic daleel of Imaam al-Albaani i.e. the hadeeth of Mu'aadh ibn Jabal (radiallah anhu), that it has no existence with this chain.

The narrators of this hadeeth, at times, narrated it as a Musnad of Mu'aadh ibn Jabal (radiallah anhu), and sometimes they introduced it as a Musnad of Abu Tha'labah (radiallah anhu), and sometimes they took it as the Musnad of Aa'ishah (radiallah anha), and some declared it to be the Musnad of Awf bin Maalik (radiallah anhu).

In short, all this difference came into existence due to the narrators narrating it from Imaam Makhool etc.

The opinion of Imaam Abu Haatim:

The first one to uncover the truth of this narration was the Imaam in the field of Illal, Abu Haatim ar-Raazi (rahimahullah).

Therefore, Imaam Abu Haatim said:

((هذا حديث منكر بهذا الإسناد، لم يرو بهذا الإسناد غير أبي خُليد، ولا أدري من أين جاء))
(به! قلت: ما حال أبي خُليد؟ قال: شيخ

“This hadeeth is Munkar with this chain. Abu Khulayd is alone in narrating with this chain. I do not know where he took this chain from! Ibn Abi Haatim asked: What is the condition of Abu Khulayd, he replied: ‘He is a Shaikh’”

[Al-Illal by Ibn Abi Haatim: 2012]

As if, Abu Haatim is saying that this hadeeth is Munkar because of its baseless chain. This Jarh of Imaam Abu Haatim can also be understood with another view, through that which he said while criticizing Ibn Jurayj that:

((ولا أدري ابن جريج من أين جاء به؟ والناس يروونه عن إبراهيم بن ميسرة عن أنس))

“I do not know why did Ibn Jurayj narrate it (through the chain: from Zuhri from Anas)? Whereas, other narrators narrated it from Ibraaheem bin Maysarah from Anas”
[Al-Illal: 893]

The purpose of Imaam Abu Haatim is that the narrating of it by Ibn Jurayj from Zuhri instead of Ibraaheem bin Maysarah is Baseless. Don't know how Ibn Jurayj brought the reference of Imaam Zuhri between him and Anas? Even though Imaam Ibn Jurayj is Thiqah Faqeeh wa kana Yudallis wa Yursal [Taqreeb: 4695]

Looking at both the examples, it becomes clear that if a chain or a text is narrated as a result of the doubt of a narrator then it becomes baseless and its unawareness by the millions of Huffaadh is its bright Daleel. That is why, just like Ibn Jurayj An Zuhri An Anas is baseless, similarly, the narration of Abu Khulayd is also baseless.

The opinion of Imaam Daraqutni:

After Imaam Abu Haatim (rahimahullah), the ocean of the knowledge of Illal al-Hadeeth, Imaam Daraqutni also affirmed that the narrators narrating it from Imaam Makhool have also narrated it as Musnad of other Sahaabah besides Mu'aadh ibn Jabal (radiallah anhu) and sometimes they narrate it as a saying of Imaam Makhool himself, the details of which will come at a suitable place In-sha-Allaah. After mentioning the Idtiraab in its chain, Imaam Daraqutni said:

[والحديث غير ثابت] [علل الدار قطنى، ج: ٦، ص: ٥١]

“This hadeeth is Ghayr Thaabit (unproven)”
[Illal ad-Daraqutni: 6/51]

The student of Imaam al-Albaani (rahimahullah), Shaikh Abdul Qadir bin Habeebullah al-Sindi (rahimahullah) said, while giving preference to the saying of Imaam Abu Haatim (rahimahullah) that:

إسناده منكر موضوع كما قال أبو حاتم وعنه ابنه عبد الرحمن فى العلل كما مضى، ولا ((
(يصلح للمتابعات والشواهد، فضلاً أن يكون حجة

“The chain (of the hadeeth of Mu’aadh) is Munkar & Mawdoo’ as said by Imaam Abu Haatim and as narrated by him from his son Abdur Rahmaan in al-Ilal. This narration can neither be presented as a Mutaabi’ah nor as a Shaahid, so as to make it Hujjah”

[Al-Tasawwuf fi Meezaan al-Baheth wal Tahqeeq by Sindi: 1/555]

Another student of Imaam al-Albaani (rahimahullah), Shaikh Abu Ubaydah Mashhoor bin Hassan Aal Salmaan (rahimahullah) said, while giving preference to the opinion of Imaam Abu Haatim and Imaam Daraqutni that:

ولهذا الاختلاف قال أبو حاتم الرازى كما مضى فى طريق أبى خلود " لا أدري من ((
أين جاء به ". وقال فيه "شيخ" ومنه تعلم أن حديث معاذ وأبى ثعلبة حديث واحد، اضطرب
(فيه الرواة على مكحول

“Due to this Ikhtilaaf (Idtiraab) Imaam Abu Haatim said regarding the route of Abu Khulayd: ‘I do not know where he took this chain from’ and said: ‘He is Shaikh’. This proves that the hadeeth of Mu’aadh and Abu Tha’labah is the same. The narrators narrating it from Makhool have done Idtiraab”

[Tahqeeq Kitaab al-Majalisah wa Jawaahir al-Ilm: 3/308]

The second Chain of this narration:

The second chain is also severely weak, which is also narrated from the Prophet (peace be upon him) through the following route:

سليمان بن أحمد الواسطي ثنا أبو خلود ثنا ابن ثوبان حدثني أبي [عن مكحول] عن خالد بن
معدان عن كثير بن مرة الحضرمي عن معاذ بن جبل

**“Sulemaan bin Ahmed al-Waasiti narrated, who said: Abu Khulayd
narrated to us, who said: Ibn Thawbaan narrated to me, who said: my
Father narrated to me, from Makhool, from Khaalid bin Ma’daan from
Katheer bin Murrah al-Hadrami from Mu’aadh bin Jabal”**

[Musnad ash-Shamain: 1/130]

The Muhaqqiq of Musnad Shamain said that the Published nuskha does not contain the addition of “From Makhool”. I have added it from myself. It is possible that due to the mistake of Copyist, Khaalid bin Ma’daan was written instead of Makhool.

No matter what the condition may be, the grandfather & teacher of Imaam Tabaraani (rahimahullah), Sulemaan bin Ahmed al-Waasiti is declared to be a Kadhaab (Liar) by Imaam Ibn Ma’een. [ad-Du’afa wal Matrokeen by Ibn al-Jawzee: 2/14]

Imaam Ibn Adee said: **“The ahadeeth of Sulemaan contain lone and Ghareeb narrations. He was a stealer of ahadeeth according to me...”** [al-Kaamil: 3/1140]

His memory deteriorated at the end of his age and he used to love drinking alcohol and he became used to listen to Music, due to which Muhadditheen abandoned him. [Meezaan ul-I’tidaal: 2/194]

This detail proves that Sulemaan also stole this hadeeth from somewhere. The Muhaqqiq of Musnad Shaimain has narrated it from Makhool, whereas, Imaam Daaraqutni narrated it without the reference of Makhool and said that: **“Both those chains are Ghayr Mahfoodh (unpreserved) [1- the chain of Makhool from Maalik bin Yukhaamir from Mu’aadh & 2- Khaalid bin Ma’daan from Katheer bin Murrah from Mu’aadh]”** [Illal: 6/51]

After the explanation of Imaam Abu Haatim and Imaam Daaraqutni, the narrating of it by Ibn Hibbaan in his Saheeh, the saying of Haythami that its narrators are Thiqah, and the Authentication of Imaam al-Albaani based on the apparent chain does not benefit, because with regard to its chain, it's just like non-existent and the chain or matn or both of which hadeeth gets proven to be wrong then how can it strengthen other narrations, whereas, it itself does not have any base.

Ghalat (wrong) cannot strengthen another Ghalat (wrong):

Imaam al-Albaani said concerning this:

((أن الشاذ والمنكر مردود، لأنه خطأ والخطأ لا يتقوى به))

“Verily Shaadh and Munkar is rejected, for verily it is a Mistake and a mistake and cannot strengthen each other.”

Moreover, he said:

((وما ثبت خطؤه فلا يعقل أن يقوى به رواية أخرى في معنابا، فثبت أن الشاذ والمنكر مما ((لا يعتد به ولا يستشهد به، بل إن وجوده وعدمه سواء

“And that (chain or text) which gets proven to be a Mistake, it cannot strengthen the narration same in meaning than it. This proves that Shaadh and Munkar are a type of hadeeth which do not count and neither can they be used to strengthen each other; rather its existence and non-existence are same.”

[Salaat ut-Taraweeh: Pg. 57]

This is why, Imaam Ahmed bin Hanbal (rahimahullah) said:

والمنكر أبدا منكر

“And a Munkar always remain Munkar”

[Al-Illal wa Ma’rifat ur-Rijaal narrated by al-Marwazi: Pg 167; Masaail al-Imaam Ahmed narrated by Ibn Haani: 2/167]

We have proven this narration being Munkar from Imaam Abu Haatim and unproven from Imaam Daaraqutni above. In light of the sayings of these two Muhadditheen and the sayings of Imaam al-Albaani and Imaam Ahmed, it is proven that the Munkar narration of Mu’aadh will always remain Munkar. It cannot strengthen any other narration. In fact, it cannot even strengthen the narration of the same meaning. This is the meaning mentioned by Shaikh Taariq bin Awdhullah in the Muqaddimah of his book “Al-Irshaadaat fi Taqwiyyat ul-Ahadeeth bish-Shawaahid wal Mutaabi’aat”.

Dear Readers! The opinion of Imaam Abu Haatim and Imaam Daaraqutni is more authentic and established against the opinion of Shaikh Albaani.

This was the Most authentic proof according to Imaam al-Albaani in proving the virtues of 15th night of Sha’baan. This is why he declared this hadeeth to be the basis and narrated other shawaahid in its support.

Now we will present the comments on his other proofs:

The First Shaahid: Hadeeth of Abu Tha’labah:

Imaam al-Albaani (rahimahullah) said:

“Al-Ahwas bin Hakeem narrates from Muhaasir bin Habeeb from Abu Tha’labah, from the Prophet (peace be upon him). Imaam Haythami declared Al-Ahwas bin Hakeem to be Da’eef. In Tabaraani and Bayhaqi it also says: Makhool An Abu Tha’labah. Imaam Bayhaqi (rahimahullah) said:

((. وهو بين مكحول وأبى ثعلبة مرسلٌ جيدٌ))
”[السلسلة الصحيحة، ج: ٣، ص: ١٣٦ ملخصاً]

Imaam al-Albaani, in his claim, has mentioned two chains of this hadeeth from Abu Tha’labah, whereas, both these chains are also a result of Idtiraab which Imaam al-Albaani did not know about.

First Illat: The first condition of Idtiraab:

It is due to this idtiraab in the narration that Al-Ahwas bin Hakeem narrates it from Muhaasir bin Habeeb from Abu Tha’labah, which Imaam al-Albaani calls the first chain. This chain is present in: As-Sunnah by Ibn Abi Aasim (H. 511), Mu’jam us-Sahaabah by Ibn Qaani’ (H. 303), Masheekhat Abi Taahir bin Abi al-Saqar al-Lakhmi al-Anbaari (H. 10), Sharh Usool I’tiqaad Ahl us-Sunna by Lakaa’ee (760), Illal ad-Daaraqutni (6/51, 14/218) and others.

Muhaasir bin Habeeb az-Zubaydi Abu Damrah ash-Shaami has been declared Thiqah but Ibn Hibbaan has differed over him being a Taabi’ee or Taba Taabi’ee. That is why, he sometimes mentions him among Taabi’een (ath-Thiqaat: 5/454), and sometimes among Taba Taabi’een (ath-Thiqaat: 7/525-526).

The second condition of Idtiraab:

If he is a Taba’ Taabi’ee then his narration from Abu Tha’labah is Munqati’, as Muhaasir bin Habeeb has also narrated the same narration from Makhool from Abu Tha’labah, meaning, he narrated through the route of Makhool, which Imaam al-Albaani calls a second chain [See: Shu’b al-Emaan 3832; Fadhaail al-Awqaat 23]. If we accept this chain to be correct then the narration of Makhool from Abu Tha’labah is also Munqati’ and Mursal because he only heard from a few Sahaabah and those Sahaabah do not include Abu Tha’labah. Imaam Abu Haatim said, I asked Imaam Abu Mishar: **‘Did Makhool**

hear from any Sahaabi?’ He replied: ‘According to us, his sama is not correct except from Anas bin Maalik’ [al-Maraseel by Ibn Abi Haatim: 789]

Imaam Abu Dawood also included Waathilah bin al-Asqa’ and Abu Amaamah besides Anas bin Maalik among those from whom Makhool heard. [al-Maraseel: 323-323]

Haafidh al-‘Alaa’ee said regarding Imaam Makhool and Abu Tha’labah that: **“Makhool was a contemporary of Abu Tha’labah and they shared the same city, that is why it is possible that Makhool, as his usual practice, would have done Irsaal from him, and Makhool also used to commit tadlees”** [Jaami ut-Tahseel: 796]

Therefore, Imaam al-Albaani’s declaring of the chain of Makhool An Abu Tha’labah as a separate chain, and Imaam Bayhaqi’s declaring it Jayyid is not Jayyid.

Multiple conditions of Idtiraab:

Al-Ahwas bin Hakeem sometimes narrates it from Muhaasir bin Habeeb from Makhool, and sometimes he narrates it without the reference of Muhaasir directly from Makhool. [Shu’b al-Emaan: H. 3831; Illal ad-Daaraqutni: 6/51]

Sometimes, Al-Ahwas narrates it from Habeeb bin Suhayb from Makhool instead of Muhaasir. [al-Mu’jam al-Kabeer by Tabaraani: 22/223 H. 590]

And sometimes, he drops the reference of Makhool. [Al-Mu’jam al-Kabeer: 22/223 H. 593; al-Illal al-Mutanahiyah by Ibn al-Jawzee: 2/70 H. 920; Illal ad-Daaraqutni: 6/51, 323, 14/218]

Second Defect:

The central narrator of this hadeeth, al-Ahwas bin Hakeem is himself weak and unreliable. Muhadditheen have done Mufassar Jarh upon him.

Imaam Ali ibn al-Madeeni said: **“Don’t write his narrations”** [ad-Du’afa by Abu Nu’aym: 23]

Imaam Ibn Hibbaan said: **“He narrates Munkar narrations from Famous narrators, Yahya bin Sa’eed al-Qattaan and others abandoned him”** [Al-Matrokeen: 1/175]

Imaam Ahmed bin Hanbal said: **“Don’t narrate his narrations because he used to make ahadeeth Marfoo [by mistake]”** [al-Jarh wat Ta’deel: 2/328]

In another place, he said: **“He is Da’eef, his hadeeth is equal to nothing”** [Baher ad-Dam by Ibn Abdul Haadi: 51]

Imaam Daaraqutni said: **“He is Munkar ul-Hadeeth”** [Ad-Du’afa wal Matrokeen: 122]

That is why, such a narrator cannot be used as a Mutaabi’ or a Saahid. Even though Imaam Ibn Adee treated him leniently by saying: **“His ahadeeth are written, there is no munkar in his narrations, but he narrates such chains in which he is not followed”** [al-Kaami: 1/406] as if Imaam Ibn Adee agrees that he is often alone in narrating chains and he narrates it with multiple ways, as he also narrated the Marfoo’ narration of Abu Tha’labah with multiple ways, whose detail has passed before.

Allaamah Abdul Qaadir Habeebullah Sindhi said: **“Leave aside taking evidence from him, Al-Ahwas bin Hakeem cannot even be presented as a support in Mutabi’ah and Shawaahid, therefore this narration of his and other narrations will not be relied upon.”** [al-Tasawwuf: 1/558]

Third Defect: The Mursal narration of Hajjaaj:

Moreover, besides Al-Ahwas, Hajjaaj bin Artat also narrates the same narration from Makhool from Katheer bin Murrah al-Hadrami as a Mursal

narration. [Musannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah (29859); Shu'b al-Emaan (3831); Fadhaail al-Awqaat (23); Illal ad-Daaraqutni (6/51, 14/218)]

The first defect in this chain is the inqita between Hajjaaj and Makhool. Hajjaaj is Sudooq Katheer ul-Khata wa Tadlee [Taqreeb: 1239], and he did not hear this narration from Makhool. Even though Imaam Abu Dawood has affirmed the sama of Hajjaaj from Makhool [Jaami at-Tahseel: 192], but Imaam Abu Zur'ah rejected his sama from him [Al-Maraseel by Ibn Abi Haatim: 164; Jaami at-Tahseel: 192]. Imaam al-Ijlee besides negating his sama also affirmed that he used to commit Irsaal from Makhool [Ma'rifat uth-Thiqaat wad-Du'afa by Ijlee: 1/284; Taareekh ath-Thiqaat by Ijlee: 251] so there is inqita between Hajjaaj and Makhool. The second defect in this chain is that Katheer bin Murrah narrates it as Mursal and it is proven that he is a Taabi'ee [Taqreeb: 6323] which is why the narration is Mursal and he narrates it as Mursal [Jaami at-Tahseel: Pg 318 # 615]. That is why, the Irsaal of Katheer also makes the weakness in Marfoo hadeeth more strong, as Haafidh Bayhaqi has declared the Mursal narration to be Jayyid.

Hajjaaj is not alone in narrating from Makhool, rather Qays bin Sa'd is his Mutaabi' [Musannaf Abdur Razzaaq: 7923]. But the student of this Mutaabi', al-Muthanna bin as-Sabaah is weak [Taqreeb: 7296], and it is an established rule that a Mutaabi'ah is only affective if the chain up to Mutaabi' is Saheeh [See: Al-Irshadaat by Shaikh Taariq bin Awdhullah: Pg 64]

Besides these narrators, other narrators narrate this chain with different ways which Imaam Daaraqutni has mentioned in Kitaab al-Nuzool.

The Jarh of Muhadditheen on this Hadeeth:

This is why Haafidh ud-Dunya, Imaam Daaraqutni said: **“This hadeeth is Ghayr Thaabit due to it being Mudtarib”** [Illal ad-Daaraqutni: 6/324]

Imaam Ibn al-Jawzee said: **“This hadeeth is not authentic”** [al-Illal al-Mutaahiyyah: 2/80 H. 920]

The famous Muhaqqiq, Shaikh ash-Shareef Haatim bin Aarif al-Awni said:
“There is Idtiraab in this hadeeth which Imaam Daaraqutni has mentioned in al-Ilal and al-Nuzool” [Tahqeeq Masheekhah Abi Taahir: Pg 78]

Shaikh Abdul Qadir Habeebullah as-Sindhi said: **“The hadeeth of Abu Tha’labah is not Saheeh, it is neither able to be used in Mutaabi’ah nor in Shawaahid.”** [al-Tasawwuf fi Meezaan al-Baheth: 1/559]

Since the hadeeth of Mu’aadh and the hadeeth of Abu Tha’labah are the same, therefore, none among them strengthen each other.

Second Shaahid: The Hadeeth of Abdullah bin Amr:

Shaikh Albaani writes:

“Ibn Lahee’ah narrates from Huya bin Abdullah from Abu Abdur Rahmaan al-Hubli from Abdullah bin Amr from Prophet (peace be upon him) the same hadeeth.

There is nothing wrong in presenting this chain in Shawaahid and Mutaabi’aat. Imaam Haythami said: Ibn Lahee’ah is Layyin ul-Hadeeth and the other narrators of this chain have been declared thiqah. Haafidh Mundhiri called this chain to be Layyin. But Rushdayn bin Sa’d bin Huya has done Mutaabi’ah of Ibn Lahee’ah which is narrated by Imaam Ibn Haywiyyah in Juzz Hadeethah. That is why this chain is Hasan”

[Silsilah as-Saheehah: 3/136]

Answer:

Ibn Lahee’ah:

In the first chain mentioned by Imaam al-Albaani, is Ibn Lahee'ah who is Mutakallim Feeh, regarding whom there have been differences since the time of Mutaqaddimeen. Some Muhadditheen have also included him among the Mukhtalat narrators; and due to his Ikhtilaat, his students have been divided into two groups – (1) Those who narrated from him before his Ikhtilaat, their narrations are considered Saheeh; (2) and those who narrated from him after his Ikhtilaat, their narrations are considered Da'eef.

But Ibn Lahee'ah was Sa'ee ul-Hifdh (weak in memory) even before his Ikhtilaat, and Ikhtilaat only made his weakness more severe. His Ikhtilaat became strong when his books were burnt and he started narrating ahadeeth from his memory. Haafidh Ibn Hibbaan and others have also interpreted this Ikhtilaat of his with Tadlees. But we come to know that there were two basic reasons due to which he used to commit mistakes: 1) His weak memory & 2) his carelessness in the narration and sama of ahadeeth.

The first reason of weakness: Weakness of Memory:

It is due to his weak memory that Imaam Abu Zur'ah ar-Raazi said: **“He has poor memory”** [Sawalaat al-Barza'ee: 2/346]

In another place, he said: **“His beginning and end is same except for Abdullah bin al-Mubaarak and Abdullah bin Waheb”** [Al-Jarh wat Ta'deel: 5/147]

Here, it is worth mentioning that his Ikhtilaat was not such that he would not even know if these are my ahadeeth or not. This is why the thiqah student of Ibn Lahee'ah, Abul Aswad said: 'His memory did not deteriorate even until the end of his age'. [Ma'rifat ur-Rijaal by Ibn Ma'een: 134, 438, 1012]

And it is the same student who used to add the narrations of other narrators along with the narrations of Ibn Lahee'ah's Shuyookh, and Ibn Lahee'ah would read them as it is. [Al-Kaamil: 4/1462]

In fact, this claim is supported by Ibn Lahee'ah's own saying that: **"If my students ask me about a hadeeth, I would say that it is not my Hadeeth"** [Tabaqaat al-Kubra: 7/516]

And sometimes, he would claim that these are my ahadeeth because of his weak memory, as will be mentioned under the second reason.

It is due to his weak memory that Imaam Ibn Ma'een said that the sama of his old and later students from him is the same. [Sawalaat Ibn al-Junaid: 393]

And in another place, he said: "He is nothing" whether he got deteriorated or not! [Sawalaat Ibn Tahmaan: 108]

The people of the city of Ibn Lahee'ah i.e. Misr, have also testified that Ibn Lahee'ah did not get Ikhtilaat. His beginning and his end are the same. [Tabaqaat al-Kubra: 7/516]

But Haafidh al-'Alaa'ee said: **"He was criticized before his Ikhtilaat, but Ikhtilaat made his weakness more severe."** [Kitaab al-Mukhtaliteen: Pg 3]

Doctor Maahir Yaaseen Fahel said: **"Ibn Lahee'ah is weak in memory except for his narrations from Ibaadalah."** [Athar Illal al-Hadeeth fi Ikhtilaaf al-Fuqaha: Pg. 81]

The second reason: Carelessness in the narration and sama of hadeeth:

The second reliable and Mufassar Jarh on Ibn Lahee'ah is that he used to act leniently in narrating and hearing ahadeeth. People used to give him their ahadeeth after twisting them, and he would narrate them with his chain; meaning, without caring that whether he heard this hadeeth from him Shuyookh or not, he would narrate them. And when people would object saying that these are not your ahadeeth, he would reply: **'Why not! These are**

my ahadeeth'. And sometimes people would recite ahadeeth in front of him and he would listen to them silently and then he would give them the Ijaazah to narrate those ahadeeth. When he would be asked [that these were not your ahadeeth so how did you give them the Ijaazah] he would reply: **'When people would ask me about these ahadeeth, I would say that these are not my ahadeeth, but they don't ask me, so I also remain silent.'**

This is the fact that Shaikh ul-Islam Imaam Bukhaari narrated from Qutaybah bin Sa'eed like this: **"Whatever book would be given to Rushdayn (bin Sa'd) and Ibn Lahee'ah, they would start reciting it without even caring."** [Taareekh al-Awsat by Imaam Bukhaari: 4/780 # 1227]

This saying of Imaam Qutaybah is also narrated by Imaam Ibn Hibbaan in Kitaab al-Majroheen [1/303]

Imaam Abu Dawood the author of al-Sunan (rahimahullah) [Sawalaat Abu Dawood lil Imaam Ahmed: 256] with his chain, and Imaam Ukaylee with his chain, narrated from Imaam Ahmed (rahimahullah) that: **"After the books of Ibn Lahee'ah were burnt, people would bring to him the books of other people and he would start reading them."** [Ad-Du'afa al-Kabeer by Ukaylee: 2/295]

This action of Ibn Lahee'ah is also testified by the people of his homeland. [Tabaqaat al-Kubra: 7/516]

The Egyptian Student of Ibn Lahee'ah, Sa'eed bin Abi Maryam, who is declared Thiqah Thabat Faqeeh by Ibn Hajar [Taqreeb: 2524] said that at the end of the age of Ibn Lahee'ah, I saw the people of Barbari Tribe that they were presenting the narrations of Iraaqi narrators to Ibn Lahee'ah, and Ibn Lahee'ah was approving them, so I said to him: **'O Abu Abdur Rahmaan (Ibn Lahee'ah) these are not your ahadeeth' so he replied: 'Why not! They have passed by my ears'.** [al-Jarh wat Ta'deel: 5/146; Al-Kaamil: 4/1462]

Similarly, another student of Ibn Lahee'ah, Al-Nadar bin Abdul Jabbaar Abul Aswad said: **"We used to join the narrations of other narrators along with the narrations of Ibn Lahee'ah's Shuyookh, and Ibn Lahee'ah would read them as it is"** [Al-Kaamil: 4/1462]

A similar saying is also said by Yahya bin Hisaan at-Taneesi al-Basari [Thiqah: Taqreeb (8481)]. [Al-Majroheen: 2/13]

It is proven from these sayings that Ibn Lahee'ah would not care whether he heard so-and-so hadeeth from his teacher or not, and his students used to do this [join other narrations with the narrations of his Shuyookh] to test him.

This is why Imaam Muslim said that **Imaam Abdur Rahmaan bin Mahdi, Imaam Yahya bin Sa'eed al-Qattaan, and Imaam Wakee' ibn al-Jarraah abandoned him.** [al-Kuni wal Asmaa: 1/519 # 2060]

Imaam Ibn Mahdi and Imaam Yahya al-Qattaan are the Imaams of Jarh wat Ta'deel. If these two Imaams together agree on the weakness of a narrator then that narrator cannot be Thiqah by any chance. Therefore, Imaam Dhahabi said: **"The one who is criticized by these two [Imaams] - by Allaah - his Jarh cannot be far."** [Dhikr man Yu'tamad Qauluhu fil Jarh wat Ta'deel by Dhahabi: 167]

Haafidh Sakhaawi has also trusted this opinion of Imaam Dhahabi. [al-Mutakallimoon fi ar-Rijaal Pg 90]

Therefore, in light of the saying of Imaam Muslim, the status of Ibn Lahee'ah can very well be imagined. In fact, Shaikh Muhammad Tal'at has preferred the view that Ibn Lahee'ah is Da'eef ul-Hadeeth, no matter if the one narrating from him is Ibaadalah or someone else, but the narration of Ibaadalah is less weak than the narrations of other narrators. [Mu'jam ul-Mudalliseen by Muhammad bin Tal'at: 294]

In another place, he said: **“The preferred view regarding Ibn Lahee’ah is that his narrations from Ibaadalah are relied upon but they are not taken as Hujjah and the reason for this is the weakness of Ibn Lahee’ah himself.”** [Mu’jam ul-Mudalliseen: Pg 505]

Shaikh Taariq bin Awdhullah said: **“Ibn Lahee’ah is Da’eef Mutlaqan”**
[Haashiah Muntakhab Al-Ilal: Pg 249]

For more details regarding Ibn Lahee’ah, see: [Tahqeeq wa Ta’leeq al-Nafah al-Shazi fi Sharh at-Tirmidhi by Doctor Ahmed Ma’bad Abdul Kareem (2/794-863); and Al-Taziyeel Ala Tahdheeb at-Tahdheeb by Shaikh Muhammad Tal’at (Pg. 213-221) and others]

The narration on the virtues of 15th Sha’baan is not narrated by Ibaadalah and others from Ibn Lahee’ah. That’s why the narration of Ibn Lahee’ah cannot be presented as a support. Therefore, this narration is weak due to the weak memory of Ibn Lahee’ah and his carelessness in narration and sama of ahadeeth.

Second Defect:

Ibn Lahee’ah has narrated this narration from Huya bin Abdullah from Abu Abdur Rahmaan al-Hubli from Abdullah bin Amr. And Imaam Ibn Adeel has narrated several different Munkar narrations from the same chain under the biography of Ibn Lahee’ah’s Shaikh, Huya bin Abdullah. [Al-Kaamil by Ibn Adeel: 2/855-856]

Which proves that Huya bin Abdullah has narrated several Munkar narrations, and those Munkar narrations also include the hadeeth on virtues of 15th Sha’baan.

Translator’s Note: Moreover, Imaam Ahmed bin Hanbal said regarding Huya bin Abdullah that: **“His ahadeeth are Munkar”** [al-Jarh wat Ta’deel: 1214].

Imaam Bukhaari said: “Feehi Nadhar” [Taareekh al-Kabeer: 269]. This is the most severe criticism used by Imaam Bukhaari. End Note

Third Defect:

Hassan bin Moosa has narrated this narration from Ibn Lahee’ah right at the very end of his age when people would present their ahadeeth to Ibn Lahee’ah, and he would approve them without even caring. Therefore, the Imaam and Doctor of the field of Illal, Imaam Ali ibn al-Madeeni said: **“Hassan bin Moosa has narrated from Ibn Lahee’ah at the end of his age”** [Musnad al-Faarooq by Ibn Katheer: 2/649]

Therefore, this chain fulfills the criteria of a chain which is filled with Darkness upon Darkness and thus weak and unreliable.

A look at the Mutaabi’ah of Rushdayn:

Imaam al-Albaani writes:

“Rushdayn bin Sa’d bin Huya has done the Mutaabi’ah of Ibn Lahee’ah, thus the chain is Hasan” [as-Saheehah: 3/136]

Answer:

Rushdayn is also a Da’eef narrator. One of the weakness in him was the same as in Ibn Lahee’ah, as Imaam Bukhaari narrated from Imaam Qutaybah bin Sa’eed that: **“Whatever book was given to Rushdayn, he would start narrating from it carelessly.”** [Taareekh al-Kabeer by Bukhaari: 3/337; Ad-Du’afa as-Sagheer by Imaam Bukhaari: 43]

Haafidh Ibn Hibbaan (rahimahullah) has informed about this fact by saying: **“He would answer every question, and whatever book was given to him, he would start narrating it, no matter if those are his ahadeeth or not”** [Al-Majroheen: 1/303]

On top of that, Rushdayn bin Sa'd is a Weak narrator. Imaam Ibn Ma'een said: **"His ahadeeth are nothing"** [Ma'rifat ur-Rijaal by Ibn Ma'een narrated by Ibn Mahraz Pg 76; Taareekh Ibn Ma'een by Ad-Dauri: 3/276, 4/414]

Imaam Ibn Ma'een also said: **"Do not write his narrations [meaning, not even for support]"**. [al-Jarh wat Ta'deel: 3/513]

Imaam Ibn Numayr also said: **"Do not write his narrations"** [al-Jarh wat Ta'deel: 3/513]

Imaam Abu Haatim ar-Raazi said: **"He is Munkar ul-Hadeeth, he was careless, and he used to narrate Munkar narrations from Thiqah narrators, he was Da'eef ul-Hadeeth"** [al-Jarh wat Ta'deel: 3/513]

Imaam al-Juzjaani said: **"He had many Mu'addal and Munkar narrations"** [Ahwaal ur-Rijaal: 275]

In fact, Imaam Nasaa'ee said: **"He is Matrook"** [ad-Du'afa wal Matrokeen by Nasaa'ee: 212]

Ibn Hajar also said: **"He is Matrook (Abandoned)"** [al-Talkhees ul-Habeer: 1/15]

Therefore, how can such a narrator be a support for another narration? The conclusion is that this hadeeth remains Da'eef.

Third Shaahid: The Hadeeth of Abu Moosa al-Asha'ri (radiallah anhu):

Imaam al-Albaani writes:

“Ibn Lahee’ah narrates from az-Zubayr bin Saleem from ad-Dahhaak bin Abdur Rahmaan from his father, who heard Abu Moosa, and he narrates from the Prophet the same hadeeth.

Imaam Ibn Majah (1390), Imaam Ibn Abi Aasim & Imaam Laalkaa’ee have narrated it.

I (Shaikh Albaani) say: This chain is Da’eef due to the weakness of Ibn Lahee’ah. Abdur Rahmaan bin Azrab, the father of Dahhaak is Majhool. Imaam Ibn Majah has declared him unreliable in narrating from Ibn Lahee’ah”

[Silsilah as-Saheehah: 3/136]

Besides Sunan Ibn Majah, this hadeeth is also narrated in: as-Sunnah of Ibn Abi Aasim [1/223], Fadhaail al-Awqaat of Bayhaqi [# 29], Sharh Usool I’tiqaad Ahl us-Sunnah of Lalkaai [3/447], al-Ilal al-Mutanaahiyah of Ibn al-Jawzee [2/71], Tahdheeb al-Kamaal of al-Mizzi [6/288], and others.

Like the hadeeth of Abdullah bin Amr, the central narrator of this hadeeth of Abu Moosa is also Ibn Lahee’ah. We have explained the important details above that, besides having a weak memory, Ibn Lahee’ah was also very careless in narrating and hearing ahadeeth. That’s why; this chain is also differed upon.

Dispute in the second chain:

The first chain is that which Imaam al-Albaani has mentioned. Whereas, in the second chain, Al-Waleed bin Muslim is narrating from Ibn Lahee’ah who in turn narrates it from Az-Zubayr bin Saleem instead of ad-Dahhaak bin Ayman. The second difference is that in this chain, he does not even mention the reference of “An Abeeh (from his father)”. Waleed bin Muslim is Katheer ut-Tadlees and at-Taswiyyah. [Taqreeb: 8397]

Imaam Ibn Majah has mentioned both these chains in his Sunan [1390], and Imaam Mizzi [Tahdheeb al-Kamaal: 6/277-278] and Ibn Hajar [Tahdheeb at-Tahdheeb: 3/315-316] etc have explained the same Ikhtilaaf.

The reason for this Ikhtilaaf is Ibn Lahee'ah. Though besides Imaam Mizzi & Haafidh Ibn Hajar, others have also explained this Ikhtilaaf under the discussion of the narrators of this hadeeth: Ad-Dahhaak bin Ayman, Abdur Rahmaan bin Azrab, and az-Zubayr bin Saleem; from which this conclusion can also be taken out that the reason for this Ikhtilaaf can also be these Majhool narrators besides Ibn Lahee'ah. But since the Jarh on Ibn Lahee'ah is more than these three Majhool narrators, so it seems more suitable to declare him the cause of this Ikhtilaaf.

Inqita in the chain:

The narration of ad-Dahhaak bin Abdur Rahmaan, in the chain presented by Imaam al-Albaani, through the reference of "An Abeeh (From his Father)"; and his narration in the chain of Waleed bin Muslim without the reference of "An Abeeh (from his Father)" also makes it clear that the hearing (Sama) of Ad-Dahhaak from Abu Moosa is also not proven, that's why this chain is also Munqati'.

Haafidh Iraaqi has also narrated from Imaam al-Illal, Abu Haatim that the narration of Ad-Dahhaak from Abu Moosa is Mursal. [Tuhfah al-Tahseel by Iraaqi: P. 154]

While discussing the same hadeeth, Haafidh al-Manawi narrates the saying of Haafidh al-Iraaqi that Ad-Dahhaak did not hear anything from Abu Moosa. [Fadh ul-Qadeer by al-Manawi: 2/263]

Just as ad-Dahhaak's meeting from Abu Moosa is not proven, similarly, the meeting of "Abeeh (his Father)" is also not proven from Abu Moosa. Therefore, Maulaana Abul Hassan as-Sindhi has narrated from Haafidh al-Mundhiri that

the meeting of Abdur Rahmaan bin Azrab is not proven from Abu Moosa.
[Mir'aat ul-Mafateeh: 4/341]

This is what Haafidh Ibn Hajar has also pointed towards with the expression of Tamreedh. [Atraaf ul-Musnad al-Muta'li (7/96), Athaaf al-Maharah (10/32)]

Majhool Narrators:

Besides this defect in hadeeth that they did not hear from Abu Moosa, the narrator Abdur Rahmaan bin Azrab is also Majhool. [Taqreeb: 4414]

And this defect is also accepted by Imaam al-Albaani. Similarly, the student of Ad-Dahhaak and the teacher of Ibn Lahee'ah, az-Zubayr bin Saleem is also Majhool. [Taqreeb: 2179]

Imaam Dhahabi said: **“Shaikh and his Student both are Majhool. He has no student apart from Ibn Lahee'ah”** [Meezaan ul-I'tidaal: 2/67]

In the narration narrated by Waleed bin Muslim, the narrator ad-Dahhaak bin Ayman al-Kalbi is also Majhool. [Taqreeb: 3279, also see: Meezaan ul-I'tidaal of Imaam Dhahabi: 2/322]

That is why, this hadeeth is Da'eef as well, and the reason for this is Ibn Lahee'ah himself. Haafidh Ibn al-Jawzee also said while considering him the cause that: **“This hadeeth is not Saheeh, Ibn Lahee'ah is wasted (Dhaahib) in hadeeth”** [al-Ilal al-Mutanahiyyah: 2/71]

Haafidh Busayri has also added the tadlees of Waleed bin Muslim along with Ibn Lahee'ah to be the reason of weakness. [Misbaah uz-Zajaajah: 1/247]

Maulaana Ubaydullah Rehmaani al-Mubaarakpoori has mentioned the Jahaalat of ad-Dahhaak bin Ayman as well along with Inqita. [Mir'aat ul-Mafateeh: 4/341]

That's why, how can the narration, with such weakness be the support for other narrations? Especially the one who's based on the Mudtarib ul-Hadeeth and Sa'ee ul-Hifdh narrator like Ibn Lahee'ah.

Note: In as-Sunnah [of Ibn Abi Aasim: 1/223], it mentions Rabee' bin Sulemaan instead of Zubayr bin Saleem; and in Sharh I'tiqaad Usool Ahl us-Sunnah [3/447], it mentions Zubayr bin Sulemaan. Both these names are wrong. The correct name is Zubayr bin Saleem, as affirmed by Imaam al-Mizzi in Tahdheeb al-Kamaal.

Fourth Shaahid: The hadeeth of Abu Hurayrah (radiallah anhu):

Imaam al-Albaani writes:

“In Musnad Bazaar, it is narrated from Hishaam bin Abdur Rahmaan from A'mash from Abu Saalih from Abu Hurayrah (radiallah anhu) from the Prophet [same hadeeth].

Imaam Haythami said: “I do not know Hishaam bin Abdur Rahmaan and the remaining narrators are Thiqah.”

[Silsilah as-Saheehah: 3/137]

No doubt that Hishaam bin Abdur Rahmaan is a Majhool narrator as narrated by Imaam al-Albaani from Imaam Haythami. In al-Taareekh al-Kabeer [8/199], Imaam Bukhaari has mentioned his only one student (Abdullah bin Ghaalib al-Abadaani) and only one Teacher (A'mash), which is also a proof of him being Majhool.

Haafidh Bazzaar also said while pointing towards the tafarrud of Hishaam that Hishaam has no Mutaabi' (support). [Kashf ul-Astaar: 2/436]

Imaam A'mash is Katheer ut-Tadlees:

The second weakness in this hadeeth is the tadlees of Sulemaan bin Mehraan al-A'mash. In Tabaaqaat al-Mudalliseen [Pg 43], Haafidh Ibn Hajar has mentioned him among the second level of Mudalliseen, meaning, those whose tadlees is very little according to him; but later on he changed his view and mentioned him among the third level of Mudalliseen in Al-Nakat Ala Ibn as-Salaah [2/640], regarding whom Haafidh Ibn Hajar himself said: "They are those who do a lot of Tadlees and they are known for this".

The last view of Ibn Hajar is the most authentic one, because al-Nakat was written after Tabaaqaat al-Mudalliseen. Even Doctor Masfar Dameeni has said that Ibn Hajar should have mentioned A'mash among the third or fourth level of Mudalliseen instead of the third level. [al-Tadlees fil Hadeeth: Pg 305]

Therefore, it gets proven that Imaam A'mash is Katheer ut-Tadlees. Haafidh Abu Zur'ah ibn al-Iraaqi, Haafidh Suyooti, Imaam Dhahabi, Imaam Maqdisi and others have also mentioned him among the Mudallis narrators. In fact Haafidh Abul Fath al-Azdi has said that we don't accept the tadlees (An'ana) of A'mash. [al-Kifayah by Khateeb Baghdaadi: 2/387]

In fact, Haafidh al-'Alaa'ee said: "**He is famous with Tadlees and he commits it a lot**". [Jaami at-Tahseel: Pg 228]

Imaam A'mash commits tadlees from Da'eef, Majhool, and Matrook narrators, but besides, he also commits Tadlees at-Taswiyah, as explained by Imaam Uthmaan bin Sa'eed ad-Daarimi [Taareekh Uthmaan ad-Daarimi: Pg 243] and Imaam Khateeb Baghdaadi [al-Kifayah: 2/390]

A'mash narrates this narration from Abu Saalih and it is narrated with AN, due to which it is Da'eef.

In short, this narration is Da'eef due to the Jahaalat of Hishaam bin Abdur Rahmaan, and the Tadlees of A'mash. And such a narration cannot support or be a Mutaabi' for another narration.

Fifth Shaahid: The hadeeth of Abu Bakr as-Sideeque:

Imaam al-Albaani writes:

“Abdul Malik bin Abdul Malik narrates from Mus’ab bin Abi Dhi’b from al-Qaasim bin Muhammad from his Father or his Uncle, from Abu Bakr as-Siddeeqe from the Prophet [the same narration]

Imaam Mundhiri said there is nothing wrong in its chain. Imaam Haythami said that Imaam Ibn Abi Haatim mentioned Abdul Malik bin Abdul Malik in al-Jarh wat Ta’deel but did not declare him Da’eef. The remaining narrators of this chain are Thiqah.”

Imaam al-Albaani said: “Mundhiri and Haythami have said right. Imaam Bukhaari said regarding Abdul Malik: ‘Fee Hadheethihi Nadhar’, and Imaam Bukhaari meant by this the same narration on the virtues of 15th night of Sha’baan as mentioned by Haafidh Dhahabi in Meezaan.”

[Silsilah as-Saheehah: 3/137]

This narration is present in: Ar-Radd Ala al-Jahmiyyah by ad-Daarimi [Pg 34-35], As-Sunnah of Ibn Abi Aasim [1/222], Kitaab at-Tawheed by Ibn Khuzaymah [Pg 136], Dhikr Akhbaar Asbahaan by Abu Nu’aym [2/2], Tabaqaat al-Muhadditheen bi-asbahaan by Abi ash-Shaikh [2/149-150], Ad-Du’afa al-Kabeer by al-Ukaylee [3/29], Sharh us-Sunnah by al-Baghwi [4/127], Musnad al-Bazaar [1/157, 206], Kashf ul-Astaar by Haythami [2/435], Shu’b al-Emaan [3/381], Al-Kaamil by Ibn Adee [5/1946], Sharh Usool I’tiqaad Ahl us-Sunnah [3/438-439], al-Ilal al-Mutanaahiyyah [2/66-67], and others.

First defect:

The saying of Imaam Haythami that Imaam Ibn Abi Haatim mentioned Abdul Malik in al-Jarh wat Ta'deel but did not declare him Da'eef, and Imaam al-Albaani's approving of him is not correct. Because Imaam Abu Haatim declared three narrators of this chain to be Majhool (Da'eef): (1) Abdul Malik bin Abdul Malik, (2) his student, (3) & his teacher.

The words of Imaam Abu Haatim are narrated by his son like this:

"مصعب بن أبي ذئب: روى عن القاسم بن محمد، روى عنه عبد الملك بن أبي ذئب. روى عمرو بن الحارث عن عبد الملك بن عبد الملك عن مصعب بن أبي ذئب هذا. سمعت أبي يقول ذلك. ويقول: لا يعرف منهم إلا القاسم بن محمد يعني في الإسناد.

[al-Jarh wat Ta'deel: 8/306]

As if Imaam Abu Haatim is commenting on this very hadeeth that its three narrators are Majhool. In fact, Imaam Daaraqutni declared Mus'ab bin Abi Dhi'b to be Matrook. [Sawalaat al-Barqaani: 508]

Second Defect: The Munkar narration of Abdul Malik:

Imaam Abu Haatim declared Abdul Malik to be Majhool but the correct opinion is that he is a Da'eef narrator and this narration of his is Munkar. Therefore, Imaam Bukhaari said while pointing to this hadeeth of his that: **"Feehi Nadhar (severely weak), his narration from the people of Madeenah (on the virtues of 15th Sha'baan)"** [Taareekh al-Kabeer: 5/424]

Imaam Ibn Adee has also mentioned this Jarh of Imaam Bukhaari under the introduction of Abdul Malik. [al-Kaamil: 5/1946]

After mentioning this hadeeth in Sharh us-Sunnah, Imaam Baghwi mentioned this Jarh of Imaam Bukhaari. As if both these Imaams have agreed with Imaam Bukhaari.

While explaining this Jarh of Imaam Bukhaari (mentioned above), Imaam Dhahabi said: **“Imaam Bukhaari is pointing towards the hadeeth on the virtues of the night of 15th Sha’baan, which is narrated by Abdul Malik.”** [Meezaan ul-I’tidaal: 2/659]

In fact, the student of Imaam Bukhaari, Aadam bin Moosa says that Imaam Bukhaari narrated this hadeeth to us. [ad-Du’afa al Kabeer by Ukaylee: 3/29]. And in Ad-Du’afa al Kabeer & Meezaan ul-I’tidaal [2/659], the Jarh of Imaam Bukhaari is also present that he said: **“Feeh Hadheethihi Nadhar (His hadeeth is severely weak)”**.

Haafidh Ibn Hajar has also narrated the same words from Imaam Dhahabi. [Lisaan ul-Meezaan: 4/67]

Imaam Ibn Hibbaan said: **“He [Abdul Malik] is a severe [Jiddan] Munkar ul-Hadeeth. He narrates such narrations in which he is not followed. Therefore, it is better to abandon the narrations in which he is alone”** [al-Majroheen: 2/136]

This is why Imaam Daaraqutni said: **“He is Matrook”** [Sawalaat al-Barqaani: 304]

Thus, this hadeeth is Munkar and Severely Weak and the cause for this is Abdul Malik. This is why, Imaam Bukhaari has pointed towards this hadeeth under his introduction.

Imaam Ukaylee [Du’afa al-Kabeer: 3/29], Imaam Ibn Adeer [al-Kaamil: 5/1946], and Imaam Dhahabi [Meezaan: 659] and others have mentioned this Munkar narration under the tarjumah of Abdul Malik.

Imaam Baghwi has narrated this narration being Munkar from Imaam Abu Haatim [Sharh us-Sunnah: 4/127], and we have already mentioned above that Imaam Abu Haatim declared three of the narrators of this chain to be Majhool.

Imaam Ibn Ade'e said: **"Abdul Malik bin Abdul Malik is famous for this hadeeth, and one narrating it from him is Amr bin al-Harith, and this hadeeth is Munkar with this chain"** [al-Kaamil: 5/1946]

Imaam Ibn al-Jawzee said: **"This hadeeth is not Saheeh and it is not proven"** [al-Ilal al-Mutanahiyah: 2/66-67]

The Doubt of Qaasim bin Muhammad:

One reason for the weakness of this hadeeth is also that Qaasim bin Muhammad bin Abi Bakr as-Siddeeqe narrates it with doubt as it says: **"from his Father OR from his Uncle, who in turn narrates from Abu Bakr as-Siddeeqe"**.

"An Abeeh (from his father)": This is meant to be Muhammad bin Abu Bakr.

"An Ammuhu (from his Uncle)": This is meant to be Abdur Rahmaan bin Abi Bakr.

If we consider the first condition to be correct then the sama (hearing) of Qaasim bin Muhammad is not proven from his Father (Muhammad bin Abi Bakr), as affirmed by Haafidh al-'Alaa'ee [Jaami at-Tahseel P. 310], Imaam Dhahabi [Siyar: 5/54], and Haafidh Ibn Hajar [al-Amaali al-Mutlaqah: Pg 122]

Similarly, the sama (hearing) of Muhammad bin Abi Bakr from his Father – the first caliph, Abu Bakr as-Siddeeqe is also not possible, because Muhammad bin Abi Bakr was born during the journey of Hijrat ul-Wada'. [Saheeh Ibn Khuzaymah: 4/167 & Jaami at-Tahseel: Pg 310]

When Abu Bakr as-Siddeeqe (radiallah anhu) passed away, his son was less than three years old. [Al-Baheer al-Zakhaar: 1/156]

Haafidh al-Bazaar has also affirmed that Muhammad bin Abi Bakr did not hear [ahadeeth] from his father because of his small age. [al-Baheer al-Zakhaar: 1/157]

So this chain contains Inqita upon Inqita. Qaasim bin Muhammad did not hear from his father Muhammad bin Abi Bakr, and Muhammad bin Abi Bakr did not hear from his Father Abu Bakr (radiallah anhu).

In short, this chain is severely weak because of (1) the weakness of Abdul Malik, (2) Presence of two Majhool narrators: Amr bin al-Haarith and Mus'ab bin Abi Dhi'b, & (3) the doubt in the chain.

Sixth Shaahid: Hadeeth of Awf bin Maalik (radiallah anhu):

Imaam al-Albaani writes:

“Ibn Lahee’ah narrates from Abdur Rahmaan bin An’am from Ubaadah bin Nasi from Katheer bin Murrah from Awf bin Maalik from the Prophet.

Imaam Bazaar has declared this hadeeth Da’eef. According to me, the defect in it is Abdur Rahmaan bin An’am. Imaam Haythami has also declared this hadeeth Weak due to this reason. Therefore he said: Imaam Ahmed bin Saalih has done his tawtheeq but Jumhoor has declared him Da’eef. Ibn Lahee’ah is Layyin, and other narrators are Thiqah.

I (Albaani) say: Makhool has opposed Ubaadah bin Nasi by narrating it from Katheer bin Murrah from the Prophet as a Mursal report. Imaam Bayhaqi has declared it Jayyid as a Mursal, as is said by Haafidh al-Mundhiri”

[Silsilah as-Saheehah: 3/137-138]

Imaam al-Albaani has accepted this narration being weak and he also mentioned that Makhool has opposed Ubaadah bin Nasi. But what we want to say is that indeed Abdur Rahmaan bin An'am al-Afreeqi is Da'eef, but it also includes his student Ibn Lahee'ah, and this is the third hadeeth of Ibn Lahee'ah on this issue. Meaning, the narrator of the hadeeth of Abdullah bin Amr and Abu Moosa is also Ibn Lahee'ah, which we have mentioned under the second and third shaahid respectively. Therefore, this possibility cannot be ignored that this narration came into existence due to the tasaahul of Ibn Lahee'ah.

Or else this is the result of that Idtiraab which we have mentioned under the hadeeth of Mu'aadh and Abu Tha'labah, and it will also be mentioned ahead under the hadeeth of Aa'ishah.

Imaam al-Albaani also said while explaining the difference of the narrators of hadeeth that Makhool has narrated it from Katheer bin Murrah as a Mursal report while opposing Ubaadah bin Nasi. Whereas the difference of narrators in narrating it from Makhool or Katheer bin Murrah is much bigger than this. And each of its chain is weaker than the other. And this is such an Idtiraab in which it is very difficult to give preference to one chain over another. Among these Mudtarib chains, one of the Marfoo chains is that which Imaam al-Albaani has mentioned as the sixth shaahid.

Idtiraab in the chain:

When Ubaadah bin Nasi narrated it from Katheer bin Murrah, Ibn Lahee'ah and Al-Afreeqi made it Marfoo'. When Makhool and Khaalid bin Ma'daan narrated it from Katheer, they made it Mursal. The narration of Khaalid bin Ma'daan is mentioned by Imaam al-Haarith in al-Musnad. [Baghiyat ul-Baahith by al-Haythami: 1/324]

Haafidh Ibn Hajar [al-Mataalib al-Aliyah: 6/162], and Imaam Busayri [athaaf al-khairah: 3/84-85] have narrated it with the same reference. Its narrators are Thiqah.

The narration of Makhool is narrated by Hajjaaj bin Artat. [Musannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah: 6/108, Kitaab al-Nuzool: 82, Illal ad-Daaraqutni: 6/51, Shu'b al-Emaan: 3/381, Fadhaail al-Awqaat: 122]

Qays bin Sa'd has done the Mutaabi'ah of Hajjaaj bin Artat [Musannaf Abdur Razzaaq: 4/317] but its chain is Da'eef due to al-Muthanna bin as-Sabaah.

Further dispute on Katheer bin Murrah:

The students of Makhool ash-Shaami sometimes, narrate it as a saying of Katheer. [Musannaf Abdur Razzaaq: 4/316, Kitaab al-Nuzool: 83]

In Kitaab al-Nuzool [83], the grandfather of Imaam Daaraqutni, Ibraaheem bin Mahshar bin Ma'daan is declared to be "Da'eef Stealer of hadeeth" by Ibn Ade'e [al-Kaamil: 2/747]. Imaam Fadhal bin Saalih also criticized him and called him a liar. [Taareekh Baghdaad: 6/185, Lisaan: 1/95]

Muhammad bin Yoosuf narrates it from Ibn Thawbaan from his Father from Makhool from Khaalid bin Ma'daan from Katheer bin Murrah as a personal saying of Katheer. [Kitaab al-Nuzool: P 84]

Whereas, Abu Khulayd narrates it from Ibn Thawbaan from his Father from Khaalid bin Ma'daan from Katheer bin Murrah from Mu'aadh from the Prophet as Marfoo. [Illal ad-Daaraqutni: 6/51]

Abu Khulayd sometimes narrates it from Ibn Thawbaan and Awzaa'ee from his Father from Makhool from Mu'aadh bin Jabal as Marfoo. And this is the chain which Imaam al-Albaani declared to be the foundation and then presented seven shawaahid under it. In the previous pages, we have explained

the narration of Mu'aadh being Munkar and baseless for which we also presented the saying of Imaam Abu Haatim and Imaam Daaraqutni.

The students of Imaam Makhool sometimes narrate it from Abu Idrees as Mursal [Illal ad-Daaraqutni: 6/51] and sometimes as Maqtoo' (the saying of a Taabi'ee). [Kitaab al-Nuzool: 85] and sometimes they narrate it from Aa'isha as Marfoo [Illal ad-Daaraqutni: 14/217], and sometimes Makhool narrates it directly from the Prophet [Kitaab al-Nuzool: 87, 86], and sometimes they narrate it as a saying of Ka'b al-Ahbaar. [Kitaab al-Nuzool: 87]

It is due to this Idtiraab that Imaam Daaraqutni said at several places that this hadeeth is not proven.

The purpose for mentioning this Idtiraab succinctly is to prove that the narrators of hadeeth narrate it in different ways. When someone would narrate it as Marfoo, so Shaikh Albaani thought that it is its Shaahid. Whereas that chain itself is a cause of Idtiraab. That's why, its existence and non-existence are the same. And the reality of this hadeeth is the same as the hadeeth of Mu'aadh and Abu Tha'labah, or as the hadeeth of Abdullah bin Amr and Abu Moosa which is narrated by Ibn Lahee'ah.

Seventh Shaahid: The hadeeth of 'Aa'ishah (radiallah anha):

Imaam al-Albaani writes:

"Hajjaaj (bin Artat) narrates from Yahya bin Abi Katheer from Urwah (bin az-Zubayr) from Aa'ishah (radiallah anha) as Marfoo'.

All its narrators are Thiqah except that Hajjaaj bin Artat is a Mudallis and is narrating it with AN. Imaam Tirmidhi said I heard Imaam Bukhaari declaring this hadeeth weak"

[Silsilah as-Saheehah: 3/138]

This narration is present in: Musnad Ahmed [6/238], Sunan Ibn Majah [1389], Musannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah [6/108], Musnad Ishaq bin Rahwayh [2/326-327], Shu'b al-Emaan [3/379], Fadhaail al-Awqaat [H 28], Ad-Da'waat al-Kabeer, Sharh us-Sunnah by Baghawi [4/126], Musnad Abd bin Humayd [3/233], Masheekhah Abi Taahir by Muhammad al-Anbaari [P. 76-77], Sharh Usool I'tiqaad Ahl us-Sunnah by Lalkai [3/448], Al-Illal ad-Daaraqutni [3573], Al-Illal al-Mutanahiyah [2/66], and others.

The Jarh of experts of this field:

The narration of this hadeeth as Marfoo is also a mistake by the narrators of this hadeeth, and this chain as well came into existence as a result of Idtiraab. This is why, while discussing this hadeeth, Imaam Tirmidhi said:

“We don't know this hadeeth of 'Aaishah except through this chain from the hadeeth of Hajjaaj; and I heard Muhammad – meaning, Al-Bukhaari, declaring this hadeeth weak.” And Imaam Tirmidhi further said: **“Yahya bin Abi Katheer did not hear from Urwah and Hajjaaj did not hear from Yahya bin Abi Katheer.”** [Tirmidhi: 739]

So Imaam Tirmidhi has pointed towards the tafarrud of Hajjaaj bin Artat and Inqita in two places in the chain. Besides Imaam Tirmidhi, Imaam al-Ijlee has also pointed towards this, that Hajjaaj bin Artat did not hear anything from Yahya bin Abi Katheer. He narrates from him as Mursal, and his case with Makhool is also the same. [See: Ma'rifat uth-Thiqaah by Ijlee: 1/284]

Apart from this tafarrud and Inqita, Hajjaaj is also a Mudallis [Mu'jam ul-Mudalliseen by Shaikh Muhammad Tal'at: Pg 129-130] and Yahya bin Abi Katheer as well is a Mudallis. [Mu'jam ul-Mudalliseen: Pg 496-498] and the narration is Mu'an'an.

Due to this mursal narration of Yahya bin Abi Katheer, Imaam Haakim has declared it Munkar and unproven. Therefore, Imaam Bayhaqi narrates from his Shaikh, Imaam Haakim that: **“What is preserved in this hadeeth is that Hajjaaj bin Artaat narrates it from Yahya bin Abi Katheer as Mursal.”** [Shu’b al-Emaan: 3/379]

This means, the reference of ‘Aa’ishah (radiallah anha) in this hadeeth is Munkar; and what is preserved is that Yahya has narrated it as Mursal. Imaam Bayhaqi has also approved the opinion of Imaam Haakim by keeping silent.

Imaam Ibn al-Jawzee also mentioned it in al-Ilal al-Mutanahiyyah [2/66 H. 915] and narrated the saying of Imaam Tirmidhi and Imaam Bukhaari [mentioned above], and also narrated the weakening of it by Imaam Daaraqutni.

Haafidh ud-Dunya, Imaam Daaraqutni, besides mentioning the Idtiraab of narrators of hadeeth in the Musnad of ‘Aa’ishah (radiallah anha), he also mentioned the chain of the hadeeth of Abu Tha’labah and also pointed towards the Irsaal of Katheer bin Murrah al-Hadrami, and then said:

“The chain of this hadeeth is Mudtarib, Ghayr Thaabit (unproven).” [Ilal ad-Daaraqutni: 14/218]

And in the Musnad of Mu’aadh (radiallah anhu), he also mentioned the Musnad of Abu Tha’labah and ‘Aa’ishah (radiallah anha) etc. [Ilal ad-Daaraqutni: 6/51]

And said regarding all of them: This hadeeth is Mudtarib, Ghayr Thaabit, the chain of this hadeeth is Mudtarib, etc.

This proves that according to Imaam Daaraqutni, the hadeeth of Mu’aadh, Abu Tha’labah, and ‘Aa’ishah (radiallah anhum) is the result of Idtiraab.

This hadeeth of Aa'ishah has many other chains, but all of them came into existence due to Idtiraab, that's why, there is no need to go into their details. For those who are interested, see: Al-Illal al-Mutanahiyah [H. 916, 919]

Athaar of Taabi'een:

Besides the Marfoo' ahadeeth, Imaam al-Albaani has also mentioned three Athaar. Therefore, he writes:

“Haafidh Lalkaai has narrated from Ata bin Yasaar, Makhool, and Fadal bin Fadaalah with different chain as Mawqoof, and such narrations have the ruling of Marfoo' because they do not include any rayi (opinion) in them.”

[Silsilah as-Saheehah: 3/138]

Haafidh Lalkaai said: **“Al-Hussain bin Umar informed us, he said: Ahmed bin al-Hassan informed us, he said: Bishr bin Moosa narrated to us, he said: Sa'eed bin Mansoor narrated to us, he said: Abu Ma'shar narrated from Abu Haazim, and Muhammad bin Qays narrated from Abu Haazim from Ataa bin Yasaar – his saying –”** [Sharh Usool I'tiqaad Ahl us-Sunnah: 3/499]

In its chain, Abu Ma'shar Najeeh bin Abdur Rahmaan is Da'eef. [Taqreeb: 7994]

And he also got into a severe Ikhtilaat at the end of his age. [Mu'jam ul-Mudalliseen by Shaikh Muhammad bin Tal'at: Pg 316-318]

The Shaikh of Abu Ma'shar, Muhammad bin Qays is un-clarified. There are two people by the same name, the first is Qaas – famous with the title of Umar bin Abdul Azeez, and Abu Ma'shar has narrated from him as mentioned by Imaam al-Mizzi [Tahdheeb al-Kamaal: 17/171]

And the second is Muhammad bin Qays, famous with the nasab “Shaikh of Abu Ma’shar”, and is Da’eef.

Haafidh Ibn Hajar has preferred that in this chain, it is this Muhammad bin Qays (who is Da’eef), and he refuted those who say that it is meant to be Qaas Umar bin Abdul Azeez. Therefore, he writes:

“Muhammad bin Qays, Shaikh Abi Ma’shar, is Da’eef, from the fourth level and those who have confused him with the one passed previously (Qaas), have mistaken” [Taqreeb: 1/503 # 6246]

This is why the second weakness in its chain is that the Shaikh of Abu Ma’shar is Da’eef.

Note 1: It apparently seems from the chain that Muhammad bin Qays is the Mutaabi’ of Abu Ma’shar Najeeth. Whereas, he is not the Mutaabi’ rather Muhammad bin Qays is the teacher of Abu Ma’shar. This is why the correct line would be like this: “Abu Ma’shar An Muhammad bin Qays An Abu Haazim...” On top of that, Muhammad bin Qays and Abu Ma’shar have never been the Mutaabi’ of each other in any hadeeth. wallahu a’lam

Note 2: The name of the teacher and Grandfather of Haafidh Lalkaai is said to be “Ahmed bin al-Hassan” in the chain, but his correct name is “Muhammad bin Ahmed bin al-Hassan Abu Ali al-Baghdaadi, famous with Ibn as-Sawaaf”. And this name is correctly taken in Sharh Usool I’tiqaad Ahl us-Sunnah [1/55].

The Second Athar of Ataa:

After the same athar of Imaam Ataa, Haafidh Lalkaai narrated a second Athar of Ataa which is contrary to the first one. Therefore, Abdul Azeez bin Abi Rawaad narrates that the virtue of 15th night of Sha’ban was mentioned to Ataa bin Yasaar, so he said: **“I hope that every night has this virtue”** [Sharh Usool I’tiqaad: 3/451]

From this second athar, we come to know that Imaam Lalkaai is not proving the Ithbaat of the virtue of 15th Sha'baan from Imaam Ataa. Therefore, Imaam Albaani's including of Ibn Yasaar among those who held the view of its virtue is wrong.

The Athar of Imaam Makhool:

Imaam al-Albaani mentioned the second Athar of Imaam Makhool and this athar is narrated with Hasan chain.

And this is the athar which the narrators of hadeeth later narrated as Marfoo and sometimes as Mawqoof.

Note: A mistake in the publication of Fadhaail al-Awqaat: In Fadhaail al-Awqaat [Pg 122], the name of the student of Imaam Makhool is mentioned to be al-Hasan bin al-Hasan. And the Muhaqqiq of this book has also mentioned Al-Hasan bin al-Hasan in the footnote with reference to Shu'b al-Emaan.

Whereas, this is actually al-Hasan bin al-Har al-Koofi [See: Al-Taareekh al-Kabeer by Bukhaari: 2/290]. In fact, even in Shu'b al-Emaan [H. 3830 other Nuskha: 7/413 H. 3549] it is correctly written as al-Hasan bin al-Har.

In Sharh Usool ul-I'tiqaad [3/451, 452], a second chain for this athar from Imaam Makhool is also present.

The Athar of Fudayl bin Fadaalah:

In accordance to his view, Imaam al-Albaani mentioned a third Athar of Fudayl bin Fadaalah. Therefore, Haafidh Lalkaai writes:

“Ali bin Muhammad bin Umar informed us, he said: Abdur Rahmaan bin Abi Haatim informed us, he said: Abu Zur'ah ar-Raazi narrated to us, he said: Abdullah bin Abdul Jabbaar narrated to us, he said: al-Hakam bin al-Waleed narrated to us, he said: I heard al-Fudayl bin Fadal saying:

‘Allaah descends to the heaven of earth on the night of 15th Sha’baan, and gives to every follower, and frees the necks, and give a lot of reward.’”

[Sharh Usool ul-I’tiqaad: 3/452]

All the narrators of this athar are also Thiqah and Sudooq, but the tawtheeq of the one who said this i.e. Fudayl bin Fadaalah is not known. Imaam Bukhaari mentioned him in Al-Taareekh al-Kabeer [7/120-121], and Haafidh Ibn Abi Haatim in al-Jarh wat Ta’deel [7/74], but did not narrate any Jarh or Tawtheeq.

However, Ibn Hibbaan has mentioned him in Ath-Thiqaat [5/295]. Due to this, Haafidh Ibn Hajar called him “Maqbool” [Taqreeb: 6109] which means, if he has a support, only then his narration will be accepted, otherwise, rejected.

As for the tawtheeq of Ibn Hibbaan, then his tasaahul in doing the tawtheeq of Majhool narrators is very famous. That’s why, even his mentioning of him in ath-Thiqaat does not benefit.

The conclusion is that this Athar is also Da’eef because of the Jahaalat of the one who said this.

The Doubt of Haafidh Dhahabi: In Taareekh al-Islam (p. 216), Haafidh Dhahabi said: **“Fudayl bin Fadaalah is Thiqah”.**

But the proofs do not support the saying of Imaam Dhahabi. The reason for this mistake of Imaam Dhahabi is that two narrators share the same name. One is famous with the Nasab of al-Qaysi, while the second is famous with the Nasab of al-Hozni. The first narrator is Thiqah. Imaam Ibn Ma’een, Imaam Abu Haatim [al-Jarh: 7/74] and Imaam Shu’bah [ath-Thiqaat by Ibn Shaaheen: 1123] have declared him Thiqah. Whereas the second one is Majhool, as we mentioned above with reference to Imaam Bukhaari and Imaam Ibn Abi Haatim. Imaam Khateeb Baghdaadi has also separated both these narrators in accordance of these two Imaams. [Al-Muttafaq wal Muftaraq: 3/1767, 1768]

Therefore, the joining of both these narrators by Imaam Dhahabi, and his narrating the tawtheeq of al-Qaysi under the biography of Al-Hozni is wrong.

A mistake in Sharh Usool ul-I'tiqaad: The name of the shaikh of Imaam Lalkai is mentioned to be “Ali bin Muhammad bin Umar” but the correct name is “Ali bin Umar bin Muhammad”. He is a Famous Imaam, and has narrated abundantly from Imaam Ibn Abi Haatim. [See Al-Irshaad by al-Khaleeli: 2/691]. And Haafidh al-Khaleeli narrates from him very often. [Fuhrist Kitaab al-Irshaad: 3/1108]

Note: In Silsilah as-Saheehah and Tahdheeb al-Tahdheeb, al-Fudayl is mentioned instead of al-Fadal. The correct name is Al-Fudayl

Answer to a doubt:

Imaam al-Albaani writes: “**Such Athaar are Marfoo in ruling, because they do not have anything to do with ray (opinion)**” [Silsilah as-Saheehah: 3/138]

The answer is that according to the Jumhoor Muhadditheen, it is the specific kind of the opinions of “Sahaabah” which can be considered Marfoo in ruling, but this rule is not for Taabi’een. In fact, even concerning the Sahaabah, a condition has been stipulated that they should not be the one who narrate the Israa’eeli reports. Therefore, this saying of Imaam al-Albaani is also not correct.

This hadeeth does not also become Hasan Lighairih:

The question arises here that a hadeeth which is narrated by eight different Sahaabah and whose weakness is not even severe as said by Imaam al-Albaani, then how can that hadeeth not become Hasan Lighairih?

It is well known that Hasan Lidhaatih and Hasan Lighairih are one of the most difficult and complex type of topics in Mustalah al-Hadeeth, because both these types depend upon the narrators regarding whom the Muhadditheen have different opinions. Based on which, reconciling between them and taking out the correct ruling is certainly a difficult job, for which it is very necessary to have full expertise and practice in this field. Imaam al-Albaani also realizes the sensitivity of this field. Therefore, he said:

وهذا أمر صعب قل من يصير له، وينال ثمرته، فلا جرم أن صار هذا العلم غريباً بين العلماء
[والله يختص بفضله من يشاء - [الإرواء الغليل، ج: ٣، ص: ٣٦٣]

The summary is that this is a difficult field. Only a person who is blessed by Allaah can gain expertise in this field. Due to the difference in its Nadhri and tatbeeqi condition, its definition has also been differed upon, whose details are mentioned in the books of Mustalah and Jarh wat Ta'deel. The best and succinct definition is mentioned by Doctor Khaalid bin Mansoor ad-Darees. Therefore, he writes:

“A Da’eef hadeeth which is able to gain strength strengthens with another Da’eef hadeeth or ahadeeth which are able to give it strength.”
[al-Hadeeth al-Hasan Lidhaatih wa Lighairih by Doctor Khaalid: 5/2088]

And a narration can only be able to gain strength when:

- 1- Its chain does not include a narrator accused of lying, or one who is not relied upon [such as: Munkar, Matrook, Majhool etc].
- 2- It has more than one chain.
- 3- It is not against something Aqwi (stronger) than it.
- 4- The meaning of the Matn is not different.
- 5- Ikhtilaaf Makhaarij, meaning, that chain should not revolve around one narrator.
- 6- There should be Dhann Ghaalib (strong assumption of the truth) of the strength of that hadeeth with its Majmoo’ah.

See the details for all these six conditions in the book “Al-Hadeeth al-Hasan [5/2177-2234]”

Dear Readers! Looking at the definition of Hasan Lighairih and the conditions for the strength of a hadeeth, mentioned above, it is not at all difficult to decide that the ahadeeth on the virtues of 15th Sha’baan do not even reach the level of Hasan Lighairih. In fact, all of them only strengthen each other in weakness. This is why; Imaam Abu Haatim, Imaam Bukhaari, Imaam Tirmidhi, Imaam Daaraqutni, Imaam Haakim, Imaam Ukaylee, Imaam Ibn Adee, and Imaam Ibn al-Jawzee etc have criticized it either as an individual hadeeth or all of them generally. The opinions of these Experts of this field and the experts of the field of Illal are more authentic and established as compared to the opinions of Mutaakhireen (Later Scholars).

While giving strength to this Usool, The Dhahabi of his time, Imaam Abdur Rahmaan bin Yahya al-Mu’allami writes:

“[As compared to the Mutaqaddimeen (Early Scholars)] care is waajib in the Tasheeh (declaring Saheeh) or Tahseen (declaring Hasan) of Mutaakhireen” [Al-Ibaadah by al-Mu’allami with reference from al-Hadeeth al-Hasan: 5/2257]

While discussing the tahseen of Mutaakhireen, al-Mu’allami said: **“There is Nadhar (something wrong) in the tahseen of Mutaakhireen”** [al-Anwaar ul-Kaashifah: Pg 29]

And in another place, he said: **“I find Mutaakhireen mutasaahil (lenient) in many ways [as compared to Mutaqaddimeen]”** [Muqaddimah al-Fawaaid al-Majmoo’ah: Pg. 4]

The authentication of this hadeeth by Imaam al-Albaani is also a result of Tasaahul. That’s why his refutation for those who declare this hadeeth Da’eef is also not correct.

In Silsilah as-Saheeha, Shaikh Albaani criticizes Allaamah Qaasmi for declaring the ahadeeth on virtues of 15th Sha'baan to be weak. This criticism of Shaikh Albaani is not correct. We have proven from the Expert Scholars above that Allaamah Qaasmi is not the only one to declare this hadeeth Weak.

In fact, Imaam Ukaylee (rahimahullah) writes:

“The ahadeeth regarding the Nuzool of Allaah on the 15th night of Sha'baan are all weak. The Nuzool of Allaah is proven in every night, which also includes the 15th night of Sha'baan, In-Sha-Allaah.” [ad-Du'afa al-Kabeer by Ukaylee: 3/29]

Abdur Rahmaan bin Zayd bin Aslam said:

“We did not find our teachers and Fuqaha paying any attention to the 15th of Sha'baan. They would neither pay any attention to the narration of Makhool nor would they give this night any importance over other nights.” [Al-Bida' wal Naha by Ibn Wadaah: Pg 46]

Imaam Abu Bakr al-Tartooshi has also mentioned this saying in al-Hawaadith wal Bida': Pg 130.

Abu Shaamah has also narrated this saying from Al-Tartooshi in al-Baa'ith Ala Inkaar al-Bida' wal Hawaadith [Pg. 125]

It seems from this that this saying held an extra-ordinary importance for Muhadditheen.

Haafidh Abul Khattaab ibn Dihyah writes in his book “Kitaab Ma Jaa fi Shahr Sha'baan”:

“The people of Jarh wat Ta'deel say that no report regarding 15th Sha'baan is Saheeh” [al-Baa'ith by Abi Shaaq: Pg 127]

The Famous Maaliki, Imaam Abu Bakr ibn Al-Arabi (rahimahullah) writes:

“There is no reliable hadeeth regarding virtues of 15th Sha’baan, and there is no reliable report saying that in this night the decisions of deaths are taken. Therefore, these ahadeeth should not be paid any attention” [Ahkaam ul-Qur’aan by Ibn al-Arabi: 2/214]

Ataa bin Yasaar said:

“I hope that every night has this virtue.” [Sharh Usool ul-I’tiqaad: 3/451]

These [Scholars] are also included among those who graded it weak, so the refutation of Imaam al-Albaani on Shaikh Qaasmi does not give any benefit. And we have also mentioned before that many other experts have also criticized its individual chains as well as all of them generally.

And it should also be noted that if the virtues of a night are proven then it does not still prove the Ibaadaat (worships) of that night. In fact, we need a separate Nass (proof) for the establishment of Ibaadaat. Therefore, there is no specific worship in the night of 15th Sha’baan. All the narrations that have been narrated regarding the virtues of worship in this night are all Severely Weak, Fabricated, and Baseless. This is why, Haafidh Ibn al-Qayyim said:

“No hadeeth regarding [the virtues of Ibaadaat] in it are authentic” [al-Manaar al-Maneef by Ibn al-Qayyim, P. 99]

Therefore, the specific Ibaadaat of this night are all baseless, innovations, and a deception in the name of religion. Imaam Abu Shaamah has also mentioned these Bid’aat in his book “Al-Baa’ith Ala Inkaar al-Bida’ wal Hawaadith” [P. 124-137]

Conclusion:

Four (4) out of these eight (8) narrations [ahadeeth of: Mu'aadh bin Jabal, Abu Tha'labah, Awf bin Maalik, & Aa'ishah] came into existence as a result of Idtiraab. Therefore, their existence or non-existence is equal.

Besides the narration of Awf bin Maalik, the narrator of the narrations of Abdullah bin Amr and Abu Moosa al-Asha'ri is also Ibn Lahee'ah, who is Sa'ee ul-Hifdh and famous for being lenient in hearing & narrating ahadeeth.

In the Seventh hadeeth i.e. the hadeeth of Abu Hurayrah, there is A'mash present in the chain, who was Katheer ut-Tadlees; in fact, he even used to commit Tadleees at-Taswiyah. [And there is a Majhool narrator as well]

In the eighth hadeeth – the hadeeth of Abu Bakr as-Siddeeqe, Abdul Malik bin Abdul Malik is present and this is one of his Munkar narrations. In fact, Muhadditheen have mentioned this Munkar hadeeth on the virtues of 15th Sha'baan under his tarjumah. [And it has other weaknesses too]

In reality, this [hadeeth] is a saying of Makhool ash-Shaami, which the narrators of hadeeth narrated as Marfoo' because of their Doubt and Mistake. That's why these ahadeeth do not strengthen each other. On the contrary, these ahadeeth collectively make their weakness more established. This is the reason, Imaam Abu Haatim called the hadeeth of Mu'aadh to be Munkar, and Imaam Daaraqutni called it Unproven.

First Shaahid i.e. the hadeeth of Abu Tha'labah has in the chain, the central narrator by the name of al-Ahwas bin Hakeem, who is Da'eef according to the Jumhoor of Muhadditheen. And Imaam Daaraqutni and Imaam Ibn al-Jawzee are included among those who weakened this hadeeth. [See the first Shaahid to know more weaknesses]

Second Shaahid i.e. the hadeeth of Abdullah bin Amr contains in it, the famous narrator Ibn Lahee'ah. And his teacher Huya bin Abdullah narrates many Munkar narrations with the same chain, which are mentioned by Imaam Ibn Ade'e in al-Kaamil under his biography. And this narration was narrated after

the Ikhtilaat of Ibn Lahee'ah. The Mutaabi'ah of Rushdayn is of no use as well. [See the second Shaahid for more details]

Third Shaahid i.e. the hadeeth of Abu Moosa al-Asha'ri contains the same narrator, Ibn Lahee'ah. Moreover, three narrators in its chain are Majhool, and al-Waleed bin Muslim is also a Mudallis. Haafidh Ibn al-Jawzee, Haafidh Busayri and others have graded it weak.

Fourth Shaahid i.e. the hadeeth of Abu Hurayrah contains A'mash who is Katheer ut-Tadlees. [See the fourth Shaahid for more weaknesses]

Fifth Shaahid i.e. the hadeeth of Abu Bakr as-Siddeeqe is one of the Munkar narrations of Abdul Malik. Imaam Abu Haatim, Imaam Bukhaari, Imaam Tirmidhi, Imaam Ukaylee, Imaam Ibn al-Jawzee, Imaam Baghwi, Imaam Dhahabi, Imaam Ibn Hajar and others have graded it weak or narrated its weakness as accordance.

Sixth Shaahid i.e. the hadeeth of Awf bin Maalik contains Ibn Lahee'ah, and another narrator called "Abdur Rahmaan al-Afreeqi" who is Da'eef. The chain is Mudtarib. It is declared weak by Imaam Daaraqutni.

Seventh Shaahid i.e. the hadeeth of Aa'ishah is declared weak and unproven by: Imaam Bukhaari, Imaam Tirmidhi, Imaam Haakim, Imaam Daaraqutni, Imaam Ibn al-Jawzee and others.

As compared to these experts of this field and the Imaams of Illal, the opinion of Shaikh Albaani has no value. Therefore, this narration is Severely Weak.

Among the three Athaar mentioned by Imaam al-Albaani, the athar of Makhool is narrated with Hasan chain. Contrary to the saying of Imaam al-Albaani, the saying of Makhool is vulnerable to opinion and Ijtihaad.

Author: Shaikh Khabeeb Ahmed Athari

Translator: Raza Hassan
